APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,033	02/01/2001	Michael A. Friedman	MSFT-0302/167451.1	8315

7590 02/27/2004	EXAMINER
THOMAS E. WATSON	NARAYANASWAMY, SINDYA
WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MACKIEWICZ & NORRIS LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia, PA   19103

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*01 December 2003*</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27 and 42-66* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27, 42-66* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-66 are pending. Claims 28-41 are withdrawn from consideration and claims 1 –

27 and 42-66 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-17, 20, 21, 24-27, 42-58, 61-62, 65-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Paroz, US-6,587,125.

4.   As per claim 42, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein a user controls at least one

computing element (*first computing device*), the system comprising: at least one computing

element each having a canonical user interface description associated therewith; and a universal

console (*second computing device*) for controlling at least one computing element and storing

user preferences therein (col. 4, lines 5-11); wherein a computing element of at least one

computing element communicates its associated canonical user interface to the user console,

wherein the user console generates a concrete user interface description from the user interface

and the stored user preferences, and wherein a user thereafter utilizes the user console to control

the computing element via the concrete user interface by selecting at least one action-command

(col. 3, lines 16-34).

5.   As per claim 43, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein selecting at least one action-

command includes requesting information about the state of the at least one computing element

(*ability to detect changes in the status of the first computing device*) (col. 4, lines 5-11).

6.   As per claim 44, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein a user of a universal console

interacts with at least one group hierarchy to obtain data in connection with the selected at least

one action-command to be carried out by the computing element (*software intermediaries*) (Fig.

1 & Fig. 2, col. 7, lines 5-15).

7.   As per claim 45, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the storage of user

preferences includes the storage of data indicating at least one disability of the user

(*customizable/unique and different from user interface of first application*) (col. 11, lines 64-67).

8.   As per claim 46, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein at least one computing

element carries out at least one action-command (col. 11, lines 23-54).

9.   As per claim 47, Paroz teaches computer system wherein the universal console receives

notification from the at least one computing element (*output originating from application in first

computing device is sent to second computing device*) (col. 11, lines 48-51).

10.   As per claim 48, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the notification includes at

least one of an error message, warning message, status update message and state change (status

change) (col. 4, lines 17-25).

11.   As per claim 49, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the canonical user interface

description is formatted according to an XML stream (col. 10, lines 45-51).

12.   As per claim 50, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein selecting at least one action-

command includes requesting a list of available devices that may be controlled by universal

console (col. 8, lines 39-45, col. 8, lines 61-65).

13.   As per claim 51, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein communications between the

universal console and the computing element are made via HTTP (col. 3, lines 21-28).

14.   As per claim 52, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the computing element is one

from the group of a computing device and an application (*group includes mobile phone, pda,

etc.*) (col. 3, lines 28-34).

15.   As per claim 53, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the remote procedure call

mechanism makes calls according to the Simple Object Activation Protocol (*other Internet

protocols other than HTTP are used/acceptable*) (col. 7, lines 46-62).

16.   As per claims 54 and 55, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the canonical user

interface description includes a description associated with a parameter for choosing one element

a from a set *A* and a description associated with a parameter for selecting a subset *A'* from a set *A*

(personal digital assistant has single element and multiple element selection capabilities) (col.7,

lines 40-46).

17.   As per claim 56, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the canonical user interface

description includes a description associated with a parameter for selecting one from the group of

True/False, Off/On, OK/Cancel and Yes/No (col. 3, lines 15-20, col. 1, lines 59-61).

18.   As per claim 57, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the canonical user interface

description includes a description associated with a parameter for selecting an integer n in the

range n1 through n2, with an increment *(increment window size, font, etc)* (col. 13, lines 1-5).

19.   As per claim 58, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the canonical user interface

description includes a description associated with a parameter for selecting a real number x in the

range x1 through x2 with an increment *(change language, color, etc)* (col. 13, lines 1-5).

20.   As per claim 61, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the canonical user interface

description includes a description associated with a parameter type for the modification of a

given first string s, resulting in a second string s' (*change static text to something different*)(col. 11, 5-13).

21.   As per claim 62, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the canonical user interface description includes a description associated with a parameter type for ordering the elements of set A into A' (*layout manipulation*) (col. 11, 5-13).

22.   As per claims 65 and 66, Paroz teaches a computer system wherein the canonical user interface description includes a description associated with a command construct that specifies at least one action to be sent to the controlled element that will carry out the action command and a computer system wherein the canonical user interface description includes a description of the parameters associated with the at least action (*output sent to and from computing devices, user input is recognized*) (col. 11, lines 23-54).

23.   As per claims 1-17, 20, 21, 24 and 25 they are the method claims of claims 42-58, 61, 62, 65 and 66 and are rejected on the same basis.

24.   As per claims 26 and 27, they are the computer readable medium and modulated data signal claims of claim 42 and are thus rejected on the same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

25.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

26.   Claims 59-60, 63-64 and 18-19, 22-23 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Paroz, US-6,587,125.

27.   As per claims 59 and 60, in addition to what has been discussed for claim 42, Paroz does not specifically disclose the limitation of a computer system wherein the canonical user interface includes a description associated with a parameter type for an arbitrary string s or wherein the arbitrary string s is to be selected from a suggestion set of strings S. However, Official Notice is taken that selecting a string from a set of strings is well known in the art, particularly in personal digital assistants, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate string selection in order to allow the user to select text commands with ease.

28.   As per claim 63, in addition to what has been discussed for claim 42, Paroz does not specifically disclose a computer system wherein the canonical user interface description includes a description associated with a parameter type for pairing set A elements with set B elements. However, Official Notice is taken that it pairing element in a GUI is well known in the art, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to pair various elements in the user interface together in order to create an image that might improve the usability of the interface.

29.   As per claim 64, in addition to what has been discussed for claim 42, Paroz does not specifically disclose a computer system wherein the canonical user interface description includes a description associated with a group construct that contains at least one of commands and subgroups. However, Official Notice is taken that creating subgroups in within interface subgroup is well known in the art, particularly in the interface design of a personal digital assistant therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate sub-grouping in order to create a more appealing navigation system for the user.

30.   As per claims 18-19, and 22-23, they are the method claims of claims 59-60 and 63-64, and are rejected on the same basis.

Conclusion

31.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

   a. Hsu et al., US-6,633,235

   b. Huang et al., US-6,437,836

   c. Fan, US-5,926,168

32.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sindya Narayanaswamy whose telephone number is (703) 305-

8473. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm, first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached at (703) 308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-5404 for regular

communications and (703) 305-5404 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Sindya Narayanaswamy

February 23, 2004

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100